
**Intelligent Systems Research and Development Support – 2 (ISRDS-2)
Request for Proposal
Amendment #02**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The purpose of this Amendment #02 is to clarify and correct the original answers for Question #2, Question #14, and Question #7 in Amendment #01. Amendment #02 also includes a new question regarding the final RFP.

- 1. Reference:** Question #2 in Amendment #01—The definitions of Major Subcontractor for Cost purposes and Past Performance
Original Question: Are the cost thresholds for the definitions of Major Subcontractor for the priced effort or for the total expected contract value (core, contract management, and maximum IDIQ)?
The original answer is hereby deleted and replaced with the following:
“For Past Performance purposes in this solicitation, the definition for Major Subcontractor is tied to the total value of the contract and not just the Core effort.
For Cost purposes in this solicitation, the definition for Major Subcontractor applies only to the value of the priced effort (Contract Management and Core Technical Elements).”
- 2. Reference:** Question #14 in Amendment #01—L.10 (c) 3. Cost Proposal Organization, 13. Exhibit 13 Minor Subcontractor Template, Page 102: The instruction states "Minor subcontracts are those that subcontract that have an estimated total value of less than \$200,000 per year or \$1,000,000.00 for the five year inclusive effort.
Original Question: Is the value stated in the instruction only core support and not IDIQ effort.
The original answer is hereby deleted and replaced with the following:
“For Cost purposes in this solicitation, the value stated in the instruction applies only to the value of the priced effort (Contract Management and Core Technical Elements).”
- 3. Reference:** Question #7 in Amendment #01 — Attachment J.1(b)(2) Cost Template Workbook. Exhibit 18, line 30 - “For all subcontracts with an average value of \$200,000 per year or in excess of \$1,000,000 for the five-year period of performance.”
Original Question: The referenced language needs to be changed to reflect the revised definition of major subcontractor.
The original answer is hereby deleted and replaced with the following:
Exhibit 18 will be revised with correct information of \$400,000.00 per year or in excess of \$2,000,000.00 of the five-year period of contract performance. The revised Exhibit 18 will be attached to this Amendment #02.
- 4. Reference:** RFP Section L.10(a)B, Page 90, and M.2.B(a)B, Page 112

Background: RFP Sections L and M state: “Approach and management demonstrating an understanding of the technical areas of the SOW.” Please confirm that responses are not

required as part of the 50 page written response for the following non-technical areas of the SOW:

- a. SOW 2.1.1 Contract Management Requirements, core management support functions elements (1) – (10) only [addressed in 1. Organizational Structure/Partnering Approach – Oral Presentation, 2. Key Personnel – Oral Presentation, and, 3. Staffing, Recruitment, Retention and Training – Oral Presentation, RFP Sections L (Pages 85-87) and M (Pages 109-110)].
- b. SOW 5.0 Phase-in/Phase-out [addressed in 4. Phase-in Plan – Oral Presentation, RFP Sections L (Page 87) and M (Page 110)].

Question: If the Government requires written responses to these non-technical SOW elements as part of B. Technical Understanding, please clarify the relative weighting in the evaluation criteria the Written Proposal are given versus the Oral Presentation material covering the same subject matter.

Answer: The Government requires a written response only to the technical areas of the SOW in response to Section L.10(a)(B), which states “The Offeror’s proposal shall demonstrate its understanding of the requirements of the SOW and specifically address how the work would be accomplished as follows: Approach and management demonstrating an understanding of the technical areas of the SOW.” (emphasis added)

As a result of this Amendment #02, language in the RFP at L.10(c)(1)(f) and L.10(c)(1)(g) is amended as follows:

L.10(c)(1)(f), Page 97: For cost purposes, Major Subcontractors are defined as those subcontractors providing a total contract value of \$2,000,000 for the five year period of performance for the priced effort (Contract Management and Core Technical Elements).

L.10(c)(1)(g), Page 97: In addition to the Prime Offeror submitting a Volume III, Cost Proposal, for any major subcontract that has a potential estimated total value in excess of \$2,000,000 for the five year period of performance for the priced effort (Contract Management and Core Technical Elements), a Volume III, Cost Proposal must be provided following the subsequently specified format.

[End of Amendment #02]